

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-480

RAMADA CARRIER CIRCLE and INDEED,

Defendants.

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-511

COURTYARD SYRACUSE DOWNTOWN AT  
ARMORY SQUARE and MARRIOTT BONVOY,

Defendants.

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-512

QUALITY INN & SUITES DOWNTOWN  
and CHOICE HOTELS,

Defendants.

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-513

SPRINGHILL SUITES CLEVELAND  
INDEPENDENCE and MARRIOTT BONVOY,

Defendants.

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-514

COURTYARD ERIE BAYFRONT  
and MARRIOTT BONVOY,

Defendants.  
-----

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-524

EXTENDED STAY AMERICA, ESA  
MANAGEMENT LLC and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-526

BEST WESTERN PLUS and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-527

SPRINGHILL SUITES SYRACUSE  
CARRIER CIRCLE and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-528

RED ROOF INN #157 and INDEED,

Defendants.

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-529

HAMPTON BY HILTON and INDEED,

Defendants.

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-530

MOTEL 6 and INDEED,

Defendants.

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-531

EMBASSY SUITES BY HILTON and INDEED,

Defendants.

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-532

AMERICAS BEST VALUE INN and INDEED,

Defendants.

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-533

FAIRFIELD BY MARRIOTT SYRACUSE  
CARRIER CIRCLE and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-534

CRESTHILL SUITES and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-535

EXECUTIVE EAST SYRACUSE  
HOTEL LLC and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-536

RODEWAY INN BY CHOICE  
HOTELS and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

-----  
ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-537

DAYS INN BY WINDHAM SYRACUSE  
and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-538

CANDLEWOOD SUITES EAST  
SYRACUSE and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-539

DOUBLETREE BY HILTON  
SYRACUSE and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

5:22-CV-540

HOMETOWN INN BY RED ROOF and INDEED,

Defendants.  
-----

APPEARANCES:

OF COUNSEL:

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,  
Plaintiff, Pro Se  
112 Court Street, Apt. 2  
Watertown, NY 13601

DAVID N. HURD  
United States District Judge

**ORDER ON REPORT & RECOMMENDATION**

On May 17 and May 19, 2022, *pro se* plaintiff Robert W. Johnson (“plaintiff”) filed these twenty-one civil rights actions alleging he was “denied employment” and “discriminated against” by the various hotel defendants and that defendant Indeed “falsified ads and employment.” Along with each complaint, plaintiff sought to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP Application”).

On June 21, 2022, U.S. Magistrate Judge Andrew T. Baxter granted plaintiff’s IFP Applications for the purposes of filing only and advised by Report & Recommendation (“R&R”) that the complaint in each civil action be dismissed without leave to amend as frivolous.

As Judge Baxter explained, plaintiff’s pleading in each case failed to plausibly allege the basic elements of any viable claims against any of the named defendants. And as Judge Baxter noted, plaintiff’s latest set of filings were “not the first barrage of frivolous complaints filed by the plaintiff.”

To the contrary, at the time these twenty-one civil actions were filed in this judicial district, plaintiff was already subject to bar orders and filing

injunctions in the Southern District of New York, the District of Connecticut, the Southern District of Ohio, and had previously been warned by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit that his continued filing of frivolous appeals might also result in a filing injunction in that forum.

In addition, as a result of plaintiff's filing of forty-five new civil rights actions in a ten-day period, as of May 19, 2022, plaintiff had been "permanently enjoined from filing any pleadings or documents as a pro se plaintiff in this district without prior permission.

Plaintiff has filed objections in each action. Upon *de novo* review, the R&R will be accepted and adopted in all respects. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).


Therefore, it is

ORDERED that

1. The Report & Recommendation is ACCEPTED in each of the twenty-one above-captioned civil actions;
2. The twenty-one above-captioned civil actions are DISMISSED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND; and
3. Plaintiff's motions for appointment of counsel are DENIED AS MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 11, 2022  
Utica, New York.

  
David N. Hurd  
U.S. District Judge